

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the informal drawings submitted on August 13, 2001 with the enclosed replacement sheets.

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview of June 3, 2005.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 16 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, and 16.

Drawings

Applicant has enclosed six (6) properly labeled replacement sheets in accordance with 37 CFR §1.84 to replace the informal drawings submitted on August 13, 2001. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner acknowledge the replacement sheets as acceptable.

Objections

Claim 1 is objected to for a minor informality. Specifically, the phrase “an applications content selection module” has been changed to “an application content selection module,” as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis for the phrase “the server system.” Claim 2 has been amended to recite “the wireless server system.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0065774 (“Young”). Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify the present invention as recited. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to providing a wireless client with requested content based on the type of wireless client (*i.e.*, mobile phone, personal digital assistants, etc.). Specifically, parameters associated with the wireless client (*e.g.*, screen size, text format, etc.) are sent to a content provider service, which dynamically presents authorized content in a format suitable to the wireless client based on the parameters. Further, the claimed invention is implemented at the *content server level*, within a wireless server. Particularly, the load action is to remain on the particular content servers, and is not intended to be pushed to the wireless devices from gateway servers, where the formatting is performed on the gateway servers. (*See Specification, pages 7-8 and Figure 3*). Thus, solutions that provide information to wireless devices where formatting is performed at a location other than at the content server level (*i.e.*, at a gateway server) is non-analogous art.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the content presented to a wireless client is dynamically formatted based on the wireless client’s *display* needs. Specifically, claim 1 now recites “...dynamically presenting authorized content in a format suitable for display of content on said wireless client based on said particular client type...” For example, as discussed during the Examiner Interview of June 3, 2005, if the wireless client has a small screen, such as a thin and small mobile phone, then the content displayed to the mobile phone would be formatted based on the screen properties such that the displayed content is pleasing

to the eye of a user. On the other hand, if the wireless client has a large screen, then content may be formatted differently to use the full capacity of the larger screen.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Young relates to providing consumers with product information, so that the customers can purchase the product, if desired, using a wireless device to complete the electronic transaction. Young discloses presenting the customer with a product code and characteristics of the product, but is completely silent regarding formatting information presented to the customer based on the *type of wireless device* that the customer is using to complete the electronic transaction. In fact, Young doesn't care whether the customer is using a basic mobile phone or something larger, such as a PDA or Blackberry. Young is only concerned that the customer receives the product code and product characteristics on whatever wireless device the customer is using. Because of this, Young cannot possibly disclose formatting the display of information on a screen associated with the wireless client, based on the type of screen that the wireless client has, where the type of screen is determined by the type of wireless client requesting information.

Thus, it is clear that Young fails to disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claim 1. Claim 10 has been amended to include similar allowable subject matter (*i.e.*, formatting information for display on a screen associated with the wireless client) and is thus patentable over Young for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 11-12 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-9 and 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Young in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0090932 (“Bhatia”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Young fails to disclose the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Further, Bhatia fails to supply that which Young lacks. Specifically, Bhatia relates to facilitating information exchange between a telecommunications network serving a wireless communications device and an information service provider. Specifically, a Business-to-Business (B2B) engine polls a telecommunications node associated with the telecommunications network serving the wireless communications device for real-time information. The telecommunications node responds by transmitting the requested real-time information to the B2B engine, which, in turn, provides the received real-time information to the information service provider. The information service provider, in turn, provides a service, tailored according to the real-time information received, to a subscriber associated with the wireless communications device (*See* Bhatia, Abstract). Again, Bhatia is not concerned with what type of wireless device the telecommunication node is servicing. Rather, Bhatia discloses providing real-time information to a subscriber of a wireless device, and simply allows the exchange of information between two entities, and does not format the information in any way based on the type of wireless device the telecommunication node is servicing. More specifically, Bhatia does not care how the content is to be displayed on the wireless device, and therefore does not format the content so that it is properly displayed on the wireless device. Thus, Bhatia clearly fails to disclose or suggest formatting content for display on a wireless client based on the particular requirements of the type of wireless client.

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Young and Bhatia, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 2-9 and 13-15 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Further, independent claim 16 includes similar allowable subject matter as amended independent claims 1 and 10 and is patentable over Young and Bhatia for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 17-24 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/540001; P6090).

Dated: July 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA • LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments (6 Replacement Sheets)